Published on the 15th of the month

Vol. XXIX, No. 10 JANUARY, 1940

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
War-Time Speeches	511
Dr. Niebuhr and the Conflict of Loyalties ..	512
The Good Samaritan and the Robbers	513
Mutations in Theology	513
The Prince of Peace	515
The Editor.	
The Spirit of Man and the Spirit of God (II) ..	523
The Bishop of Truro.	
Havelock Ellis: Prophet and Pioneer	537
J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.	
Book Reviews:	
The Need for a New Adventure	545
Education for Christian Marriage	546
A Dutch 'Varieties of Religious Experience' ..	549
A Lectionary of Christian Prose	551
The Scourge of the Jews	552
Correspondence:	
Christ and War	553
The Bankruptcy of Pacifism	555
Why did not God stop the War?	556
Psychical Research and a Future Life	557

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1s. net Annual Subscription, 10/6

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

READINGS IN ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL

Second Series, Chapters XIII—XXI

Dr. WILLIAM TEMPLE

The First Series was published last year and aroused widespread attention and interest. In the introduction, the author stated that the work "is not a systematic commentary or exposition ; nor is it intended for scholars or theologians . . . It is an attempt to share with any who read it what I find to be my own thoughts as I read the profoundest of all writings."

The Firt Series, Chapters I—XII, already published, 8s. 6d. The Second Series, just out. **8s. 6d.**

IDEALS OF RELIGION

A. C. BRADLEY

Dr. Bradley delivered the Gifford Lectures contained in this volume in the University of Glasgow in 1907. They contain the most searching of his philosophical ideas. Though he wrote over thirty years ago, his work has a timeless quality which will prevent its going out of date. Many earnest seekers after truth will find here a satisfying answer to their doubts and difficulties.

Ready January 30th. **15s.**

ARCHBISHOP LAUD

H. R. TREVOR-ROPER

The social problems which Laud faced are still alive, whatever has become of their doctrinal expression ; and by strictly relating his theological views to their political context, the author has made Laud's career and the forces which determined it comprehensible to modern readers. At any time this fascinating biography would be well worth reading, but at present it is most relevant.

Illustrated. *Ready January 23rd.* **21s.**

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON, W.C.2

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1940. Vol. XXIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

War-time Speeches.

The problems which beset the maker of public speeches in war-time are many. The three qualities for success in peace-time, 'attitude, latitude, platitude,' will not do for war-time. War-time speeches must have a clearly defined objective and reach it by the most direct route. The problem of whether the war-time speech should touch upon religion is not easy to solve. If an Archbishop makes a war-time speech, we naturally expect religion to come into it. But we should be sorry to see the practice become general in other war-time speeches. The dangers of cant are more disastrous to religion than those of secularity. The piety of the letters of Kaiser Wilhelm I written to his Empress in the Franco-German war of 1870 were parodied in *Punch*:

> 'My dearest Augusta,
> We've given the French another buster;
> Ten thousand Frenchmen sent below,
> Praise God, from Whom all blessings flow.'

Our statesmen and leaders have not erred in that direction. On the other hand, there has been in some of their utterances —not in those of the Prime Minister and Lord Halifax—a materialistic note of complacent self-assurance based upon the knowledge of our immense resources. We doubt if it has sounded pleasantly in many English ears. Napoleon's *dictum*, 'God is on the side of the big battalions,' has not been justified

on many occasions in the long course of human history. The Hebrew sage who wrote, 'The race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong,' had much to justify his observation. Neither is it, so far as we can judge, the best causes or the most religious leaders that have been victorious. We dare not say, Time and Chance happeneth to them all. On the other hand, many Englishmen—it may be due to prejudice promoted by their education—assent silently to the *dictum* of 'the judicious Hooker,' 'Things begun religiously are ended prosperously.' The King's speech on Christmas afternoon reflected the religious feeling of the nation in a way which has awakened a profound and grateful response from all sides:

> 'I said to the man who stood at the Gate of the Year, "Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown." And he replied, "Go out into the darkness, and put your hand into the Hand of God. That shall be to you better than light, and safer than a known way."'

Dr. Niebuhr and the Conflict of Loyalties.

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, whose authority is so great in Student Christian Movement circles that it has been alleged that their version of the Second Commandment runs, 'Thou shalt love thy Niebuhr as thyself,' has recently published some extracts from his war diary, entitled *Leaves from the Notebook of a War-bound American*. As Dr. Niebuhr is popularly supposed to be a pacifist, the following citation is significant:

> 'I met a member of the Peace Pledge Union to-day. He was full of self-righteousness about the sins of the British Empire which a good Christian must disavow. . . . Whatever may be wrong with the British Empire or with American imperialism or French nationalism, it is still obvious that these nations preserve certain values of civilization, and that the terror which is sweeping over Europe is not civilization. A moralism which dulls the conscience against this kind of evil is perverse. It is well to know that God judges all men and that in His sight no man living is justified. But we are men and not God. We must make historic choices.'

A hatred of war—not necessarily the same thing as a love of peace—which evades the moral duty of distinguishing the less guilty from the more guilty in a conflict and refuses its support to the less guilty, is itself guilty of a rational and moral evasion. In the present conflict the practical issue for a rational and moral being is not, Is peace better than war? but, Which will contribute most to peace, the victory of the Nazis or the victory of the Allies? If it be clear that the victory of the Allies will contribute

most to peace, then a rational and moral obligation rests on every practical peacemaker to support the Allies.

The Good Samaritan and the Robbers.

Dr. Cyril Flower in the *Inquirer* (December 23) has raised the question as to what would have been the Good Samaritan's neighbourly duty had he arrived on the scene just as the brigands were about to rob their victim. Having implored the robbers in vain to spare their victim, ought the Samaritan to have resorted to force? Should the parable have run thus?—

A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among robbers. While they were stripping him, a Samaritan as he journeyed came upon them, and beholding their wickedness, he cried unto them, 'God forbid.' And they answered him, 'Who art thou, a Samaritan to rebuke us?' Then the Samaritan drew his sword, and the robbers fell upon him with their daggers. When the Samaritan had slain the foremost of them, seeing a Priest and Levite coming down that way, the robbers fled. Then the man who had been saved reproved the Samaritan, saying unto him, 'Why hast thou broken the Commandment, "Thou shalt not kill"?' The Samaritan answering said, 'I did it in love to thee, my neighbour.' But he replied, 'Was not he whom thou hast slain thy neighbour?' The Samaritan answered, 'I had thought that thou wast my neighbour who didst stand in such great need of my help.' And Jesus said, 'Which thinkest thou was the neighbour of the Samaritan?' And the lawyer answered, 'He on whom he showed mercy.' Then said Jesus, 'Thou hast answered right. Of a truth, the Samaritan rendered to each his due—to the helpless aid, and to him who gave no mercy he showed no mercy.'

Mutations in Theology.

The Jubilee of *Lux Mundi* has produced a valuable article on mutations in theology by Canon Barry, published in the *Guardian* of December 15. From our point of view, the most significant passage in Canon Barry's article runs as follows:

> 'A significant theology always stands in an intimate relationship to the secular needs and achievements of its day. The Christian world-view must be expressed always in terms of the dominant ideas and influences of any given historical time and place. This may sound like theological relativism, but it is surely inherent in the *Logos* doctrine. If Christ is indeed the Light that lighteth every man, then there can

> be no "final" theology. Truth must ever embody itself in new forms. Theology must be always in development. There can be no such thing as static orthodoxy.'

This is what English Modernists have been doing their best to affirm for many years past, and not without considerable influence on Anglican thought and teaching, as of course is abundantly evident in the *Doctrinal Report*. Yet Canon Barry refers to Modernism but once in his article, and then only to note that it is out of date. He writes:

> '"Modernism" is already obsolete.'

Nevertheless the paragraph which we have quoted from Canon Barry's article expresses the fundamental conviction of every English Modernist, and what Canon Barry there affirms is certainly not obsolete. Modernism, as Paul Sabatier described it, is an orientation: it is ever attempting a synthesis between the old and the new in the spheres of theology and ethics. The conclusions at which Modernists may arrive in these spheres and the formulation of those conclusions are not of the essence of Modernism at all. And the Modernist knows that these conclusions will, in due course, be replaced by others more in harmony with the growing knowledge and wider experience of the Christian Church. The label Modernism was not invented by English Modernists, nor was it at first applied by them to describe their particular outlook and endeavour. It was a label imposed on them by their opponents.

Canon Barry, in his article, makes use of the term Christian Humanism. Of it he writes:

> 'Christian Humanism which had been before, and was now to be again, the best and most characteristic fruit of Anglicanism.'

We confess that we prefer the term Christian Humanism to that of Christian Modernism. Many years ago the writer of these notes preached a sermon before the University of Cambridge, entitled 'Towards a Christian Humanism.' Unfortunately, in America especially, the term Humanism is being used to describe an ideal of life which excludes some of its noblest Christian values. Notwithstanding this debasement, we could wish that the term Christian Humanism might be brought into general use to express those convictions and ideals which Canon Barry shares with all Modernists, whether they be Liberal Catholics or Liberal Evangelicals.

THE PRINCE OF PEACE

By The Editor.

JESUS OF NAZARETH has many titles. The Prince of Peace is not the least attractive of them to-day. It is derived from Isaiah's oracle, 'Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and He shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, Divine Hero, Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace' (*Isaiah* ix, 6). St. Luke relates that His birth was hymned by angelic choirs who sang to the shepherds on the Judaean hills, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom He is well pleased' (*Luke* ii, 14).[1] But there is a note of conflict. Jesus said of Himself, 'I come not to bring peace, but a sword,' and the history of the Christian religion, from the days of Jesus down to the present time, has been more characterized by strife than by harmony. At present, not a few Christians are asking, What was really the attitude of Jesus towards war? Is it right for Christians to engage even in wars which are fought in the cause of righteousness and freedom? What is the nature of the peace which Jesus brings? Is it a peace which avoids all strife, or is it of such a kind that, although it strives, its aim is peace, and in the end its reward is peace? Is this peace of Jesus internal, a peace of the soul, or is it external, a peace which must never be broken by conflict of any kind in the external world?

Such questions are not easy to answer, partly because the evidence is fragmentary and occasional, even contradictory; partly because wishful thinking may easily determine the interpretation. There is a subtle temptation which leads those who reverence Jesus to make Him their accomplice. It is quite clear that Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount taught what is called non-resistance. He said: 'Resist not him that is oppressive'[2]; 'But whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek turn to him the

[1] The Authorised Version, which reads 'peace on earth, goodwill towards men,' is rightly replaced in the Revised Version by 'peace among men in Whom He is well pleased.'

[2] The word *poneros* does not mean precisely 'evil,' as generally rendered in A.V. and R.V., but 'greedy,' 'acquisitive,' 'covetous,' 'oppressive.'

other also. And if a man would go to law with thee and take away thy coat, let him have thy shirt also. And whosoever shall compel[3] thee to go one mile, go with him two.' These injunctions, it should be observed, go beyond non-resistance. They enjoin active co-operation with the person guilty of personal violence, legal injustice, official oppression. Their language, it will be said, is that of rhetorical hyperbole. No doubt that is the case, but are these injunctions to be obeyed or disobeyed? Perhaps the question is, rather, *How* are they to be obeyed? If they are obeyed literally, then, in any community where this is done, personal violence is encouraged, legal extortion connived at, official oppression allowed to go unchecked. This would prove most detrimental to the social life of the community, which would be placed at the mercy of its criminal classes and would for all practical purposes be deprived of the services of the police, the magistrates and just administration. Did Jesus really desire to promote such a situation? Would such a state of affairs assist the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth? It is almost impossible to think of this as the right explanation.

Some will reply: You are wrong there. Jesus had no concern with the welfare of human society as we understand it. His only concern was to get the individual soul into right relations with the Eternal. For Him the temporal and mundane had no reality. He expected 'the world' to be swept out of existence in the approaching Day of the Lord. The ethic of Jesus was merely an Interims-Ethik: that of a soul facing eternity into which it may be plunged at any moment. If Schweitzer and his followers are right, and I hardly think they are, in thus interpreting the ethical teaching of Jesus, then that teaching has no value for the modern world, for it simply cuts all the moral knots and so solves none of our social, economic and political problems. Human society has gone on for nearly 2,000 years since Jesus delivered the Sermon on the Mount, and it may well go on for 200,000 or 2,000,000 years more. It is plain that humanity needs for this world no Interims-Ethik, but one which pre-supposes a long period in which to work itself out—a world which, though it may abound with crises, is on the whole evolutionary rather than apocalyptic in character.

[3] The word 'compel' is the technical word for official exactions.

If this be the case, and if the teaching of Jesus is to have any value for such a situation, and we believe it has very great value for such a situation, it has to be obeyed in the spirit and not in the letter. The Christian leaders, who stress the non-resistance element in the teaching of Jesus and the obligation to obey it literally and in all cases, do not stress the anti-economic element in the teaching of Jesus, and the duty of obeying that literally; because if they did they would immediately render themselves and their families paupers, and assist in bringing about an economic collapse of the society in which they live and on which economically they depend for their material well-being. 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth,' 'Give to everyone that asketh of thee,' 'And from everyone that would borrow from thee, turn thou not away,' 'Take no thought for the morrow,' are not obeyed literally by those who stress the obligation to obey literally the teaching of Jesus in the matter of non-resistance.

If the teaching of Jesus is to have any value in the guidance of life in the modern world (and we are bound to-day to think as much of the social and the political side of that life as of its individual side) it is the *principles* of that teaching which must be sought out and their right applications to manifold and changing conditions duly considered. These principles, expressed in word and action, character and conduct, by Jesus Himself, are all concerned with the Kingdom of God of which God, the Divine Father of all men, is the King, and Jesus the Messiah. What then are the characteristic principles of conduct of a son of the Kingdom?

(1) *Love to God*—'the first and the great commandment.' This means that loyalty to the Divine Will claims obedience over every other loyalty. 'We ought,' as the Apostles said, 'to obey God rather than man.' Or, in the words of Jesus, 'Father, not my will, but Thine be done.'

(2) *Love to our neighbour.* This is 'like unto' the first commandment inasmuch as obedience to it is inspired by the spirit of love. But it is unlike the first in that the love is not of the same absolute character. All love of our neighbour must be subordinate to, and in harmony with, the love and loyalty we owe to God. Moreover, the second commandment is restricted

in its scope in another direction. The phrase 'as thyself' points to a man's love of himself as not being eliminated by the obligation to love his neighbour. The rights of both in this matter are equal in quality and in quantity, and the spirit of social justice must rationally determine, in any particular circumstance, *how* the love of our neighbour can be best practised for the common welfare, for it must not be forgotten that if he be our neighbour, we also are his. For our neighbour is not one but many, and these many claims on our mutual love are, in certain circumstances, conflicting, and can only be adjusted in accordance with the claims of social justice.

(3) *Forgiveness.* This no doubt is an aspect of love of our neighbour, but it is stressed with such overwhelming insistence in the teaching of Jesus that it deserves a place of its own. It has many aspects: 'Forgive and it shall be forgiven you'; 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do'; 'To whomsoever little is forgiven the same loveth little.'

(4) *Unworldliness.* This demands that moral and spiritual values must always be esteemed above material values. 'Seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness.' This principle of unworldliness will eliminate from daily life the spirit of covetousness as well as the spirit of excessive anxiety about temporal matters. As a consequence, generosity will replace greed; and faith in God's providence will eliminate the spirit of worldly anxiety. It is in the light of this principle that our Lord's commands about not laying up treasure on earth ('Sell all that thou hast') are to be interpreted. Our relationship to our possessions is, in Christ's teaching, that of stewards. Man is not the absolute owner. God is the absolute owner, and what man possesses—be it life, powers, material goods—he possesses as God's steward and must therefore administer them in accordance with God's will and as one who must render his account to God.

(5) *Fearlessness.* A Japanese professor, a non-Christian, was asked what impressed him most about Jesus. He replied, 'His courage.' This fearlessness is stressed in many ways in His teaching: fearlessness in making decisions; fearlessness in expressing convictions: fearlessness in facing suffering, danger, death in the cause of the Kingdom of God.

(6) *Truth.* Truth shewn in sincerity and reality — the detestation of hypocrisy and formalism and obviousness. What has been called the emphasis of Jesus upon *inwardness*. Many examples of this occur to the mind when the teaching of Jesus is recalled in the matter of prayer, almsgiving, fasting, ablutions, clean and unclean foods, offering of sacrifice. 'It is not by their professions, but by their deeds, ye shall know them.'

(7) *Freedom.* Freedom is closely connected with the principle of Truth. Freedom emanated from the ministry of Jesus. St. Paul wrote: 'With freedom did Christ set us free'; 'Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' The truth as Jesus taught it liberated those who accepted it from the tyranny of taboos, traditions, legalism and casuistry. 'Ye shall know the Truth,' declares the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel, and 'the Truth shall make you free.'

(8) *Prayer.* Prayer is the truest expression of faith in God and dependence on Him. 'Men ought always to pray and not to faint.' 'Ask and ye shall have; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you; for everyone that asketh, receiveth.' 'Pray to your Father in secret.' 'When thou prayest, forgive.'

(9) *Wisdom.* The wisdom of Jesus is seen in the way in which He carried out His Messianic Mission. It was this wisdom which enabled Him to die as the Christ of the Kingdom of God and so seal with His blood the supreme significance of His Mission. How Jesus achieved this in face of opposition, misrepresentation, and above all against current convictions in the minds of His contemporaries, whether disciples or antagonists, testifies to a wisdom greater than that of Solomon. When we recall how genius has suffered from posthumous misrepresentations we see the need for the warning given by Jesus to His disciples—'Be ye wise as serpents.'

These seem to us to be the outstanding principles of the teaching of Jesus. But, it will be said, surely another principle ought to be added — the principle of Peace.

Study of the ministry of Jesus, the series of conflicts which it produced with the ecclesiastical and civil authorities, gives reason to doubt whether Jesus placed as high a value upon peace as to entitle it to the supreme position which some to-day

claim for it in His religion. His Beatitude, 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God,' certainly indicates that He regarded the making of peace as a function of a son of the Kingdom. Where the Kingdom became supreme, peace must also abide as the necessary consequence, but the Kingdom must come first. Peace was, for Jesus, not a primary principle, but a consequence or result — the product of obedience to the principles which He taught. He wept over Jerusalem because her rulers and citizens had rejected the things 'which belong unto thy peace' (*Luke* xix, 42); those things which He had brought to her in His ministry as Zion's King heralded in Zechariah's oracle: 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and having salvation' (*Zech.* ix, 8; *Mt.* xxi, 5). Moreover, the peace which He is represented in the Fourth Gospel as bestowing on His disciples is of a very singular kind. He says of it: 'Peace I leave unto you, my peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid' (*Jn.* xiv, 27). 'These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye may have peace. In the world ye have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world' (*Jn.* xvi, 33).

Plainly, it is a peace in the disciple's heart, not peace in the disciple's environment. This naturally raises the issue of the attitude of Jesus towards war. Jesus, as Milton's magnificent Ode 'On the Morning of Christ's Nativity' emphasizes, was born in a period of universal peace. International war had been suppressed within the borders of the Roman Empire. Jesus was, however, faced in His mission by a military movement — the Zealot movement by which patriotic Jews plotted the liberation of their country from the Roman rule by force of arms. This movement tried to capture Jesus. Two of His disciples, Simon the Zealot and Judas the Sicarius,[4] would seem to have been members of it. He refused to have anything to do with it or to permit His Gospel of the Kingdom of God to be identified with the propaganda of Jewish patriotism. That, we believe, is the background against which His teaching inculcating non-resistance should be viewed. Jesus seems to have been as firm as St.

[4] The Sicarii or Assassins were the left wing members of the Zealot party. It seems possible that Iscariot is a corruption of Sicarius.

Paul in refusing to make His religious movement one of political revolution: 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's.' It was the extraordinary irony of His death that He was crucified between two Zealot revolutionaries and in the place of Jesus bar-Abas, their leader. The attitude of Jesus towards that movement is summed up in the saying, 'All they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword' (*Mt.* xxvi, 52), a truth which was exemplified to the full in the sanguinary overthrow of the Zealots by Vespasian and Titus.

Whether the attitude of Jesus in this particular instance is rightly interpreted as proving that He must be opposed to war in every circumstance is much in dispute. Plainly Jesus trained His disciples to advance God's Kingdom by preaching and practising the Gospel of the Kingdom after His own example. We cannot think of Him as directing them to use military force for that purpose. Yet there is a difficult and somewhat disconcerting incident related by Luke alone which has been interpreted as contradicting the claim that Jesus was a pacifist in the anti-militarist sense. It is the incident of 'the two swords.'

> 'And he said unto them, When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, Nothing. Then said he unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one. For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end. And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said unto them, It is enough' (*Luke* xxii, 35-38).

It is claimed by Dr. Eisler[5] that here Jesus is deliberately reversing the non-resistance policy of His earlier ministry. He, the disillusioned pacifist, is commanding His disciples to arm in their defence. They obeyed Him, and that is why, at the arrest of Jesus, St. Peter drew his sword and wounded the servant of the High Priest. This interpretation conflicts so acutely with the portraits of Jesus as treasured by the early Church (with the exception of the record of His expelling the traders from the Temple) that it has been generally rejected by Christian teachers. Yet we cannot feel altogether secure that this very unpopular interpretation is wrong. Its rival interpretation, that Jesus was

[5] See Eisler's *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist* according to the Old Russian version of Flavius Josephus' 'Capture of Jerusalem.' (Methuen, 1932.)

speaking here in symbols and was grieved at being misinterpreted by St. Peter and the others, whilst entirely in harmony with the rest of the recorded teaching of Jesus, yet leaves the armed attempt of His disciples to rescue Him unexplained. What the incident does suggest, however, is that Jesus had never given His disciples any systematic teaching of a definitely pacifist character. Perhaps it is to the early Christian Church, whose safety depended upon its definitely pacifist character, and not to any formal teaching of Jesus that the pacifism of primitive Christianity is due. But even supposing that Jesus did definitely forbid the use of arms in the propagation of the Gospel of the Kingdom — and we, for our part, cannot believe that He encouraged or sanctioned the use of arms for that purpose — yet this conclusion does not permit the loyal Christian to declare dogmatically that war waged, not to propagate the Gospel or to promote the authority of the Church, but to protect the weak and helpless from cruelty and tyranny, is anti-Christian. This problem clearly comes in another class.

There are some who will feel assured that because Jesus forbade His followers to use their swords to rescue Him from those who would arrest Him, that He would forbid the English and French armies to fight in defence of Czechs and Poles and Finns against ruthless tyranny. There are others who feel that the men who risk their lives and suffer and die in such a cause are shewing forth in action the Spirit of Jesus, and are by their self-sacrifice, in the cause of Righteousness and Truth and Freedom, most truly following Jesus who offered His supreme sacrifice for the extension of the Kingdom of God.

Jesus is the Prince of Peace, not because He declared against war of every kind, for it is clear that He who said 'I come not to send peace, but a sword' (*Mt.* x, 34) could hardly have done that, but because, if His principles were universally realized and acted on by mankind, universal peace, of the very highest and most enduring kind, would ensue in every sphere where rational, moral and spiritual beings exist. That this 'peace of God which passeth all understanding,' as St. Paul calls it, can be possessed even in the most ghastly campaigns and in the face of overwhelming disaster can be seen in the lives of such Christian soldiers as Marshal Foch and Sir Henry Havelock, or in the pages of Donald Hankey's *A Student in Arms*.

THE SPIRIT OF MAN AND THE SPIRIT OF GOD

II. From the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Present Day.

'The Paraclete . . . the spirit of truth.

'I tell you the truth: It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Paraclete will not come unto you: but if I go, I will send him unto you. . . . When he, the Spirit of truth is come, he shall guide you into all the truth. . . .'—*St. John* xvi, 7, 13.

I.

AT the beginning of the Christian era the Jews held firmly to their belief in One only God, dwelling in light unapproachable, whom no man hath seen, nor can see (*1 Tim.* vi, 16). The means whereby this almighty transcendent deity acted upon the world were somewhat vaguely conceived. The Deity was a Spiritual Being and operated through *Spirit* or, as some of the more academic preferred to say, through *Logos*.

The Gentile world was full of assorted beliefs in gods many and lords many (*1 Cor.* viii, 5), but the Stoic conception of a diffused divinity was fast gaining ground among the more educated. That divinity was 'envisaged under many aspects and names—Destiny, Zeus, Providence, the Universal Law, Nature':[1] it consisted, strictly speaking, of material, very fine and fiery material. Posidonius (about 100 B.C.) was the first among the Greeks (so far as we know) to say that God was *pneuma* (πνεῦμα νοερὸν καὶ πυρῶδες).

Christianity was, of course, born in Palestine, but very soon, and before any New Testament document was published in its present form, its strength lay in its Gentile rather than in its Jewish membership. One thing of which we may be certain is that, whatever were the ideas attached to the term 'Spirit' in the first days of Christianity, they were shaped not only by the traditional Old Testament associations of *ruach*, and not only by Greek notions of *pneuma*, but also, and more decisively, by new

[1] W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 272.

actual experiences within the primitive Christian community. A Power not themselves seemed to come upon believers, sometimes abruptly at particular moments, impelling them to abnormal utterance, sometimes more quietly, simply quickening their thoughts and prayers. And whenever the term 'Spirit' was used, what was essentially meant was the Power conceived to be operative in these actual experiences. That Power seemed to be Divine:

> 'on the other hand, the activities to which the Spirit impelled seemed to be largely directed towards God as Someone different from the directing Power. The prayer uttered by someone in the assembly, when possessed by the Spirit, was an utterance addressed to God.'[2]

The new love towards God of which the Christian was conscious was regarded as shed abroad in his heart by the Spirit dwelling in him, so that the Spirit was felt both as coming from God and as directed to God.

This experience seemed also to shed fresh light on the constitution of man himself. The earliest writings in the New Testament are, of course, the letters of St. Paul. In these letters *psyche* occurs only thirteen times, while *pneuma* is found 146 times. Of these, thirty refer to the human spirit, and 116 to some supernatural influence. Dr. de Witt Burton after an exhaustive linguistic study comes to the conclusion that St. Paul's use of *pneuma* is plainly kindred with, and beyond doubt directly or indirectly influenced by, the Old Testament usage of *ruach*.[3] Of the thirty instances in which St. Paul uses *pneuma* of the human spirit, sixteen refer to *pneuma* as a normal constituent in human nature: for example *Rom.* viii, 16: 'The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God.' In the other fourteen, the reference is to the higher nature of a Christian man, *e.g. Rom.* i, 9: 'God is my witness, whom I serve in my spirit in the gospel of his Son.'

As in the Old Testament, *ruach* is associated with the higher activities and operations of the inner life and *nephesh* with the lower, so in St. Paul *pneuma* is associated with the higher and *psyche* with the lower. St. Paul apparently did not like the word *psyche* in reference to the inner life at all. The *pneuma* he

[2] E. R. Bevan, *Symbolism and Belief*, pp. 188, 189.

[3] Similarly the Pauline use of *psyche* is almost identical with that of the Septuagint itself—generally a translation of *nephesh*.

regarded as being active in a new way in the believer, 'and in some passages it is impossible to say whether by *pneuma* he means the human *pneuma* of the believer now filled by the Divine *pneuma* or the Divine *pneuma* itself.'[4]

Throughout the New Testament, Dr. Hort observes, each operation or manifestation of 'the Holy Spirit' is most commonly represented as immediately due to 'a holy spirit.'[5] In *I Peter* the word *pneuma*, as applied to man, is used rather differently. It denotes 'his soul as a whole, considered as immaterial and immortal.'[6]

St. Luke is another writer who refers a great deal to the Holy Spirit. *Acts* has been called 'the Gospel of the Holy Spirit.' The Holy Spirit is shown directing the growth of the Church and is specially mentioned at crises in its advancing life (*e.g.* iv, 31; x, 19; xiii, 2; xv, 28; xvi, 6, 7; xx, 22, 23). The Church is the Community of the Spirit; and this exactly corresponds with St. Paul's doctrine that the Church is the body of which Christ is the Head, a body informed by the Spirit which is the source of unity, power, gifts, and growth.[7]

Above all, the fruits of the Spirit are ethical. That is clearly recognized by St. Paul at a time when ecstatic utterance was much valued as one of the Spirit's gifts. *Gal.* v, 22, 23, is decisive: 'But the fruit of the spirit is *love*, *joy*, *peace*, *long suffering*, *kindness*, *beneficence*, *honesty*, *gentleness*, *self-control*.' Thus from the first the Church has realized that, as Miss Evelyn Underhill puts it,

> 'we most easily recognize Spirit when it is perceived transfiguring human character.'[8]

I am inclined to think that St. Luke's use of *pneuma* is perhaps a little influenced by his knowledge of Greek medicine. The phrase 'fill with holy spirit' occurs three time in *Lk.*, five times in *Acts*, and nowhere else in the New Testament.[9] The word *pneuma* occurs thirty-six times in *Lk.* and seventy in *Acts*; twenty-three times in *Mk.*, nineteen in *Mt.*: *hagion pneuma* thirteen times in *Lk.*, forty-one in *Acts*, four in *Mk.*, five in *Mt.*

[4] Bevan, *op. cit.*, p. 196.
[5] Commentary on *I Peter*, p. 61.
[6] C. Bigg, *Commentary on I Peter*, p. 40.
[7] H. J. Carpenter, *C.S.S.S. Notes*, Ap. 1933, p. 8.
[8] *The Life of the Spirit and the Life of To-day*, p. 46.
[9] Though in *Eph.* v, 18 we have '*be filled with spirit.*'

One of the schools of medical thought which were flourishing in the first century A.D. was that of the Pneumatists, the basis of whose theory, as Galen explicitly states, was the Stoic conception of *pneuma*. According to this school *pneuma* was present in man in three forms: the coarsest form held the body together; the intermediate variety was the cause of procreation and growth; the finest was psychic *pneuma*, the seat of which was the heart.

We must remember that the ancients were ignorant of the significance of the nervous system, and the functions of the nervous system in unifying the organism were by the Pneumatists attributed, more or less, to the *pneuma*. Health, accordingly, was held to depend not only on the condition of the bodily humours, but still more upon the condition of the *pneuma*.

We must remember also that these early thinkers had no clear conception of personality, and it seems to have assisted St. Luke in his endeavour to grasp the inner working of Christianity to picture it as an infusion of *pneuma* of a uniquely valuable kind.[10]

It is at first sight a little surprising that so few references to the Holy Spirit are found in the teaching of Our Lord as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. Considering how the theology of the earliest Christian community is dominated by the doctrine of the Spirit, it would have been expected on the modern *Form-Geschichte* theory that a considerable amount of exhortation about the Spirit would have been found in the Synoptic Gospels attributed to Christ; and the fact that this is not so is in itself a valuable piece of evidence indicating that Bultmann and his friends go much too far when they regard so many of the sayings recorded in the Gospels as merely the products of the Christian community.[11]

Actually only eight sayings of Our Lord containing a reference to the Spirit are found in the first three Gospels. Of these one is a quotation from the Old Testament, and only two are unmistakably derived from the earliest sources: *Mk.* iii. 29, 'Whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never

[10] For further details reference may be made to an article by the present writer in *The Cambridge Review*, June 5, 1925.

[11] See V. Taylor, in *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Headingley Lectures), pp. 53 *ff*.

forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin.' This is paralleled in *Q*, as reproduced in *Mt.* xii, 31, 32, and *Lk.* xii, 10.

Mk. xiii, 11: 'But whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye; for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit.' This also occurs in *Q* (*Mt.* x, 20 = *Lk.* xii, 12).

The fact is that the real discovery of the Spirit came with the experience of the Christian community after the Ascension. And that is the fact that lies behind that strange expression in *Jn.* vii, 39, 'the Holy Ghost was not yet; because Jesus was not yet glorified.'

That experience of the Christian community, of course, goes back to Jesus and starts from Him. No books in the world have been in modern times examined with such minute care as the Gospels, and scholars, like the late Dr. Streeter and Professor Burkitt, have employed the exact methods of scientific study. Their researches have shown how hard it is to reconstruct in accurate detail the events of a period nearly 2,000 years ago. But as we follow their guidance and weigh their results,

> 'the conviction deepens in us,' as the Dean of St. Paul's has recently put it, 'that with Jesus a creative thought and a creative power entered into human history which cannot die and which will have a still greater future, since they are the one sure hope of mankind.' [12]

But if, as we have already seen, men found it difficult to express the relation between the Spirit and Jehovah, it is not surprising that they should have also found it difficult to express the relation between Jesus, the Spirit and Jehovah. Various approaches to some expression of these relations are attempted in the New Testament. These are suggested and controlled by actual living Christian experience.

For example, the Spiritual Power, not themselves, of which the first Christians were conscious, was felt to be equivalent to Jesus Himself. In that presence Jesus Himself was present. That equivalence was felt to be vital. The influence of the Spirit was essentially a continuation of the influence of Jesus. Conclusions reached under the guidance of the Spirit must be in line with what Jesus Himself had taught in the days of His flesh. The teaching of the historic Jesus, indeed, was the standard by which any subsequent teachings claiming to be of the

[12] Introduction to Professor Latourette's *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, I, p. vii.

Spirit must be tested. When St. Paul speaks in one sentence of the Spirit of God dwelling in us, in the next of our having the Spirit of Christ, and in the next of Christ being in us, he is all the time referring to one and the same thing. *Rom.* viii, 9, 10:

> 'But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness.'

In the Fourth Gospel when Jesus says (xiv, 18): 'I will not leave you desolate: I come unto you,' He is, as the context plainly shows, referring to the coming of the Spirit, the Paraclete,

> 'he abideth with you, and shall be in you' (xiv, 17); 'He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I have said unto you' (xiv, 26).
>
> 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you' (xvi, 12-14).

Who then was Jesus and what was His relation to Jehovah? According to the best authenticated primitive tradition, 'Son' was the term which He Himself chose and preferred: and He spoke of God as His Father in such a way that His followers felt that there was something special and unique in the relationship. Later on Christian thought tried to penetrate further into the understanding of that relationship. In *Jn.* iii, 34 Jesus is said to have received in full the gift of the Spirit, in contrast to the partial inspiration of the men of old. To Him the Spirit is given not by measure but in its fulness, and the Spirit abides in Him (i, 32). In the Prologue to the Gospel Jesus is represented as the Logos incarnate. The relation of the Logos to the Spirit is never discussed. In i, 1, we read *the Logos was God*; in iv, 24, *God is spirit.*

According to Albert Schweitzer,[13] the theory of the Fourth Gospel is that on our Lord's exaltation the Spirit was liberated from the historic personality of the Son of Man and became separated from the Logos as the Holy Spirit of which the elect among mankind could become partakers; and that the efficacy of Baptism and the Lord's Supper is due to the action of the Holy Spirit. So far I think we can to a large extent agree with

[13] *Paul and his Interpreters*, pp. 201, 202.

Schweitzer; without going on with him to attribute a crude 'speculative religious materialism' to the Fourth Evangelist. In these high matters language itself fails, and it may be misleading to draw from scattered statements such inferences as would be justified if the language were adequate.

The doctrine of the Trinity is not formulated in the New Testament, but it is foreshadowed: not only in the latest strata, such as *Mt.* xxviii, 19: 'Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,' but in the earlier too, *II Cor* xiii, 14: 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.'

II.

The Christian doctrine of the Trinity is practical rather than philosophical. It sums up historical facts. Jehovah, Jesus, the Holy Ghost: religious experience has recognized all Three. And yet the word Three in this connexion is misleading unless we balance it with the word One—all Three, One. That is the main positive assertion on the nature of the Deity common to all the Creeds. The longer creeds elaborate a little in order to rule out various suggestions made by Arians, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians. These, of course, refer to the Person of Christ. As regards the Holy Spirit there were no such theorists to refute, except the Macedonians in the fourth century, who denied the full divinity of the spirit. It is true that various writers sometimes make rather rash statements. Hermas, for example, identifies the Spirit with the pre-existent divine nature of Christ; and similarly Justin Martyr says (in reference to *Lk.* i, 25): 'the Spirit and the Power which is from God must not be thought to be aught else but the Logos, who is God's First-begotten.' But such statements are not to be pressed, and there was little controversy. The original creed of Nicaea (325) still contained only the clause 'and in the Holy Ghost.' Our 'Nicene' clause is first found in Epiphanius: 'the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified'—an expansion which may be aimed against the Macedonians. The credal addition, *Filioque*, first appears in the creeds of Spanish

councils in the fifth century, and was not adopted in Rome itself until after the final rupture with Constantinople (1054).

All along more attention was paid to the work than to the theological *status* of the Holy Spirit; and as Dr. Swete says:

> 'The worship of the Trinity was a fact in the religious life of Christians before it was a dogma of the Church. Dogmatic precision was forced upon the Church by heresy.' [14]

The Fathers very largely repeat one another and, it must be confessed, make dull reading. But every now and then we come upon a little sparkle. Thus Hermas writes:

> 'Clothe thyself therefore with cheerfulness; the Holy Spirit given to men is a cheerful spirit.' [15]

Irenaeus says:

> 'Man owes his origin to the two Hands of God, His Son and Spirit.' [16]

And again:

> 'Where the Church is, there is also the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace.'

Tertullian thus addresses the Martyrs:

> 'You are about to enter the lists in a good fight, in which the living God is president, the Holy Spirit the trainer, and Christ your Master, who has anointed you with the Spirit and brought you to the scene of conflict.'

One more quotation from the Fathers must suffice—Clement of Alexandria:

> 'The Spirit blends and unites itself mysteriously with the human spirit, as wine with water; and the true gnostic, who earnestly strives to be spiritual, is united to the Spirit through the love that knows no bounds.' [17]

The view that finally dominated Western Theology is that of St. Augustine (repeated with little modification by Thomas Aquinas)—Augustine, *de Trin.*, 9. Augustine attempts to throw light on the mystery of the interior being of the Godhead by means of a human analogy. I know myself, and the 'I' which knows and the 'self' which is known are distinguishable, and yet one and the same man; so also I love myself, and that love is distinguishable both from the 'I' and from the 'self,' though it may be said to constitute the relation between them.[18]

[14] *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p. 159.
[15] *Mand*, iii, 1, 2.
[16] Quoted Swete, *op. cit.*, pp. 87, 89.
[17] Quoted Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
[18] See N. P. Williams, *The Study of Theology* (ed. K. E. Kirk), p. 41.

We must pass on now to another important aspect of our subject.

> 'The energies of the indwelling Spirit of Christ,' writes Dr. Swete, 'can no more be limited to the individual life than a perennial fountain can be held in by narrow barriers. Spiritual life communicates itself from person to person as torch is lit from torch.' [19]

The adjective *pneumatophoros* in the Fathers is applied to persons, and I know no example of its being actually used as an epithet of the word *Church*. The Church is a society of Spirit-bearing persons. And, as a whole, when it is a real whole, is greater than the arithmetical sum of its parts, the Church may be said to be the home of the Spirit. No one has emphasized that more strongly and clearly than St. Augustine. And the Sacraments are the Sacraments of the Church, and Christian ministers are but the instruments of the Church in performing the Sacraments. St. Augustine held that the ultimate validity of the Sacraments depends upon the authority and voice of the Church, which is the home of the Spirit. In this connexion Dr. Headlam adds:

> 'If we realize that the Church is not confined to one single organization, but consists of the whole body of the faithful baptized, and that therefore all Christian societies represent, some more, some less imperfectly, the true Church, and that none of them are without the gift of God's Holy Spirit, then there will be no such society so imperfect as to be without sacramental grace.' [20]

The conception of grace to which Dr. N. P. Williams leads us in his valuable little book on *The Grace of God* is that of the personal influence of the Holy Spirit.

> 'Is it possible,' Dr. Williams asks, 'to find a way of conceiving "grace" as an interior divine impulse or influence which is genuinely that of a Person exerted upon a person?' [21]

Here we are anticipating, for the early centuries had little conception of personality. We find the Fathers, however, feeling after the idea of the personal operation of the Holy Spirit in the sacramental acts of the Church. With regard to baptism, Methodius, for example, say that those who

> 'have been baptized into Christ by participating in His Spirit may be said to have been "made christs"—anointed as God anointed Him with the Holy Ghost and with power.' [22]

[19] *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 350.
[20] *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*, p. 171.
[21] p. 113.
[22] Quoted Swete, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

Or again, take the significance of the laying on of hands with prayer as it comes before us in the New Testament. With regard to the instances there mentioned it is sufficient to say, with Dr. Swete, that in none of them

> 'is there any trace of a belief in the magical virtue of the act. It is simply the familiar and expressive sign of benediction inherited by the Apostles from the Synagogue and adapted to the service of the Church. As employed by the Spirit-bearing Body of Christ it was attended by the gifts of the Spirit for which prayer had been made in each case.' [23]

Or once again, take the Prayer of Consecration in the Eucharist. Whether there is specific mention of the Holy Spirit or not, all theologians both of ancient and modern times, of the West as well as of the East, would agree in maintaining that God acts 'through the operation of the Holy Ghost.'

The Consecration Prayer in the East has followed the type of prayer found in the so-called Egyptian Church Order—probably to be associated with the name of Hippolytus and to be dated about 225. It contains a brief *Epiklesis* in the following words:

> 'And we beseech Thee that Thou wouldst send Thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation[24] of the Holy Church, and that, gathering them into one, Thou wouldst give it to all the saints who partake, that they may be fulfilled with Thy Holy Spirit with the confirmation of their faith in truth.'

And this *Epiklesis* comes after the Words of Institution.

In the Canon of the Mass—which is really only intelligible if taken as a whole—there is no specific invocation of the Holy Ghost. But the *Quam oblationem* serves the same purpose. As Dr. Brightman puts it, the *Quam oblationem* 'simply, so to speak, lays the situation before God for Him to do what He will.' [25]

It was at this point that Cranmer's first Prayer Book (1549) had its *Epiklesis*:

> 'Heare us (O merciful father) we besech thee; and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to blesse and sanctifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloved sonne Jesus Christe.'

[23] *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 384.

[24] It is interesting to note that in the Consecration Prayer of Bishop Serapion of Thmuis (about 350 A.D.) we find the invocation of the Logos instead of the Holy Spirit at this point—'Let Thy Holy Word come upon this bread.'

[25] *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1927, p. 237.

Dr. Brightman defends this invocation of 1549 as being in accordance with Western tradition, both in position and matter. At the same time he maintains that the thought has been implicit in the Western canon all along, and there is no real necessity to be so explicit.

The Eastern order is often said by liturgiologists to represent the order of the Holy Trinity and of Redemption :

> 'the Father to whom the whole action is addressed, the Son whose redemptive acts are commemorated, and the Holy Ghost as applying that redemption.' [26]

And this is the order that was adopted in the Scottish Liturgy and in the Alternative Order of 1927-1928.

The important point to notice is the unanimity both of East and West in holding that God acts in the Sacrament through the operation of the Holy Spirit. But if that is so, and if the action of the Holy Spirit is always personal action on us as persons, then it is clear that there is required on our part an effort of receptiveness. Nothing in the spiritual life is mechanical. Personal influence invites conscious response. And so Barnabas, who is specially described as a good man full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, exhorted the new converts at Antioch that with purpose of heart they should cleave unto the Lord (*Acts* xi, 23). Barnabas was *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως*—and the Church always needs *παρακλήσις*.

During the third and fourth centuries we find an unfortunate tendency to make sacraments the only channel of the Spirit,[27] and that tendency became more pronounced in mediaeval times. But it never entirely swamped the sounder doctrine. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth : so is every one that is born of the Spirit.' 'By their fruits ye shall know them'; and the Quakers, who have no sacramental rites, have, in striking abundance, produced the fruits of the Spirit. 'The dove lights on no carrion,' said Launcelot Andrewes.[28]

According to the Reformers of the sixteenth century, 'the written Word was the principal instrument of the Spirit, who

[26] Brightman, *ibid.*, p. 242.
[27] Swete, quoted by Watkin-Jones in *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, p. 93.
[28] Quoted *ibid.*, p. 99.

would interpret its truth to the individual mind.'[29] Such a view, of course, contains a large element of truth, but it was sometimes narrowed to too small a compass. Inspiration did not cease when the Canon of Holy Scripture was completed, and Literalism is a delusion.

In the preparation of this sermon I have made use of Dr. Swete's two volumes, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* and *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*. The second volume carries the study to the end of the patristic period, that is to say, to Gregory the Great in the West and John of Damascus in the East. After Dr. Swete's death a young member of his College, H. Watkin-Jones, undertook to continue the study from the post-patristic age to the counter-Reformation. His book was published in 1922, and a very able and interesting review of it by Canon A. J. Mason appeared in the *J.Th.S.* (January, 1923). Canon Mason pointed out that while Dr. Watkin-Jones had done his work in a careful and painstaking way there had proved to be very little to discover. Canon Mason called attention to one small point illustrating popular as distinct from scholastic theology. Later writers in the Middle Ages often ended their private letters with the greeting 'May the Holy Ghost have you in his keeping.' Canon Mason also noted that Peter Abelard dedicated the oratory, where later he established Héloise as head of a new religious house, to the Paraclete.

It is to Boethius at the beginning of the sixth century that we owe the definition of 'person' which became the standard definition for the writers of the Middle Ages, and which Professor C. C. J. Webb regards as still perhaps the best that we have: *Persona est naturae rationabilis individua substantia*—the individual subsistence of a rational nature.

The schoolmen laid stress on *incommunicability*, philosophers since Descartes on *self-consciousness*, and since Kant on *will*, as characteristics of personality.

In his masterly Gifford Lectures on *God and Personality* Professor C. C. J. Webb notes that

> 'while the affirmation of Personality *in* God has been a characteristic of Christian theological terminology since the third century of our era, the great majority of Christian theologians down to quite modern times have not affirmed in so many words the Personality *of* God.'

[29] *ibid.*, p. 87.

And Professor Webb maintains that what is really meant by the attribution of personality to God is the affirmation that reciprocal personal relations may exist between Him and the worshipper.

As an eminent psychologist puts it in a book published this year,

> 'It is very certain that the idea of God can only get across *at all* to a large section of humanity in the form of personality, and therein lies at least one of the meanings and one of the necessities for Divine Incarnation. Probably the personal aspect of God is essential to *all* humanity in relation to our own personalities, created by Him for Himself as well as for us.' [30]

III.

In conclusion, I must briefly refer to another strand in the thread of the Christian doctrine of the spiritual relation between God and man which is traceable from the Bible through the Fathers to the later Christian writers, and especially the Mystics. In *Jn.* x, 35, 36, Christ is recorded as quoting *Ps.* lxxxii, 6:

> 'I have said, Ye are gods;
> And all of you are children of the Most High.'

In the *Psalm* the reference is to men commissioned by God to act for Him. And Christ argues that if Holy Scripture calls such men 'gods,' one whom the Father has set apart and sent cannot be accused of blasphemy if he calls himself God's Son.

Faith in the doctrine of the Incarnation involves belief in an affinity between God and man. There is no gulf between man and God if the Logos of God can be embodied in a truly human being. Indeed, man is the natural vehicle and means of manifestation of the Divine, which is ever seeking to be revealed by and through him.

The Greek philosophers—except, as Dean Inge says,[31] 'the godless Epicureans'—agreed in calling the highest faculty of the soul divine, and in speaking of 'the God who dwells within us.' 'In Him we live and move and have our being,' quotes St. Luke in *Acts* xvii, 28. 'One God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all,' says the *Epistle to the Ephesians* (iv, 6). And in *II Peter* (i, 4), probably the latest document of the New Testament, we find: 'That through these (the promises)

[30] E. Graham Howe and L. le Mesurier, *The Open Way*, p. 183.

[31] Here and in the succeeding paragraphs I am following Dr. Inge in *Christian Mysticism*, Appendix C.

ye may become partakers of the divine nature' (*θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*). Here the writer maintains that what the Greek philosophers taught all men are by nature, the Christian becomes by grace.

The idea of deification occupies an important position in the theology of the early Fathers: Theophilus, Irenaeus, Clement, Origen, Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Epiphanius, Cyril and a number of others, as well as the later Greek and Russian writers. They often refer to *Ps.* lxxxii, 6 in defence of the doctrine. It must suffice to quote Athanasius, *De Incarnatione* 54—thus translated by Dr. Archibald Robertson:

> 'For He was made man that we might be made God (*θεοποιηθῶμεν*); and He manifested Himself by a body that we might receive the idea of the unseen Father; and He endured the insolence of men that we might inherit immortality (*ἀθανασίαν*).

Tertullian (*De Anima* 41) says that

> 'There is a portion of good in the soul, of that original, divine, and genuine good, which is its proper nature,'

though he distinguishes it from God.

The word *synteresis*, which occurs frequently in the mediaeval mystical writers, is first found in Jerome (on *Ezek.* i). It denotes a faculty in the soul, often conceived as preserving a remnant of the sinless state of man before the fall, wherein God works immediately 'without means and without intermission.' For Eckhart and his school it is the core of the soul, 'so akin to God that it is one with God, not merely united to Him'—a notion which Dean Inge traces back to the Neo-Platonists.

Later Mysticism tended to regard union with God as inherent in the essence of the soul. The ground of the soul was held to be an emanation of the Divine nature—by Suso and Tauler, for example, in the fourteenth century. Even Augustine seems to imply some such notion when he says:

> 'From a good man, or from a good angel, take away "man" or "angel," and you find God.'

Writers who feel strongly the corruption of human nature insist that self must die before God or Christ is born in us. 'Leave nothing of myself in me,' is Crashaw's prayer. Others look for a gradual transformation: 'love changes the lover into the beloved.'

Dean Inge sums up as follows:

'We cannot draw a sharp line between the operations of our own personality and those of God in us. . . . For practical religion, the symbol which we shall find most helpful is that of a progressive transformation of our nature after the pattern of God revealed in Christ; a process which has as its end a real union with God, though this end is, from the nature of things, unrealisable in time. It is . . . *a progressus ad infinitum*, the consummation of which we are nevertheless entitled to claim as already ours in a transcendental sense, in virtue of the eternal purpose of God made known to us in Christ.' [32]

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, 1909.
2. H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, 1912.
3. H. Watkin-Jones, *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, 1922.
4. E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, 1923.
5. *The Spirit*, ed. B. H. Streeter, 1919.
6. *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Headingley Lectures), 1937.
7. W. R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 1899.

HAVELOCK ELLIS: PROPHET AND PIONEER

By J. C. HARDWICK, M.A., B.Sc.

THE industrial, urban, and (as we now see) largely artificial civilization of the nineteenth century produced, as was natural, a certain number of far-seeing individuals who revolted against it. And as the 'high spots' of this civilization were the Anglo-Saxon countries, it is not surprising that the rebels should have been Americans or Britons. In New England, Whitman and Thoreau preached 'a return to Nature'—the former with immense and even barbaric vigour, the latter more quietly, as befitted a recluse with delicate health living the simple life in his shack in the woods by the lakeside. On our side of the Atlantic the same gospel was preached, and practised, by the poet Edward Carpenter, and by the 'hermit and iconoclast' Havelock Ellis.

All these men were poets as well as prophets; Whitman and Carpenter ostensibly, and one might almost say professionally; and the other two as it were by temperament, for Thoreau was a

[32] *op. cit.*, pp. 366-368.

poet at heart, as his charming prose indicates, and Havelock Ellis in his early days actually expressed himself in verse. And they were all, without exception, 'simple-lifers,' and practised, both from principle and inclination, the nineteenth century equivalent of 'holy poverty.'

The birth-place of Havelock Ellis, by a certain poetic irony, was Croydon, a town which, in 1859, must have been (as it doubtless still is) the acme of bourgeois and suburban respectability. Yet a happy fate released young Ellis very early from this prison and transferred him to the Pacific, where he spent much of his childhood upon shipboard, his parents being connected with the sea. This life afloat incidentally bestowed upon him the inestimable advantage (for a poet and prophet) of an extremely irregular education. Thus his mind was not forced into the customary banal tracks. In spite of such defects of education, however, he settled down, at the age of sixteen, as a teacher in the New South Wales bush, and remained at this task four years, cooking his own food, enjoying solitude, and living the simple life.

The life of the recluse is an attractive one for certain temperaments, but it is apt to be individualistic and sterile, and therefore ineffective. The recluse utters his silent protest, but the gregarious world goes on its way in perfect indifference to him. In a word, he 'cuts no ice' because he has cut himself off. No mere 'escapist' can hope to do much for the world. The prophet and seer, if he is to do any good, must at all costs preserve contact with life, otherwise he becomes 'precious,' like a surrealist artist, and futile. He has no roots and withers away. Whitman bravely avoided this fate by ministering to the wounded in the Civil War between North and South, to the tragedy of which he was acutely alive, so much so that it was a crucifixion to him and ruined his health. Thus Whitman of all nineteenth century poets was most in touch with life. His *Leaves of Grass* is no mere academic, studied, polished, 'scholarly' work, but an epic—an epic of humanity, of labouring men, of mothers, of common soldiers, of all heroic 'supers' in life's drama.

Havelock Ellis took another line, though not so very different, to 'preserve contact.' He did not nurse in war hospitals, but sailed for England to take a medical degree. In 1879 he became

a student at St. Thomas's Hospital. The singular importance of this cannot be over-stressed; *the poet and prophet submitted himself to the discipline of a scientific training*. Thus the insight of the poet was strengthened and implemented by systematic knowledge. Very rarely do the two kinds of knowledge co-exist in one man; never until the present age has such a combination been possible, and it still remains extremely rare. But it is men who possess the two kinds of knowledge who will save mankind —if mankind is to be saved at all. For they alone possess the power to alter conditions.

Nineteenth century idealists had been predominantly concerned with economics and politics, and for the most part ended in mere utopianism; for there are only two issues to this sort of pre-scientific idealism — either futile utopianism or bloody revolution followed by reaction. Havelock Ellis was the first 'reformer' to attempt to reform mankind by tackling, not external conditions, but *man himself*, the biological specimen. He shifted over from economics to genetics, *i.e.* from politics to science. Social hygiene rather than social reform was his line, and he ciriticized the old methods accordingly:

> 'When we survey this movement (*i.e.* sociological observation and speculation) as a whole,' he wrote, 'we have to recognize that it is exclusively concerned with the improvement of the conditions of life. It makes no attempt to influence either the quantity or the quality of life. It may sometimes have been carried out with the assumption that to improve the conditions of life is, in some way or other, to improve the quality of life itself. But it accepted the stream of life as it found it, and while working to cleanse the banks of the stream it made no attempt to purify the stream itself.'

It need not be supposed, however, that Havelock Ellis was of the opinion that the social reform of the conditions of life was unnecessary. To assume that social reform is unnecessary because the 'acquired characteristics' which it bestows on its beneficiaries are not inherited by the next generation, was in his view as absurd as to hold that it is useless for people 'to satisfy their own hunger and thirst because their children will not thereby be safeguarded from experiencing hunger and thirst.' His view was was that the earlier stages of social reform had been necessary preliminaries to the new stage for which the time was now ripe. They must still be kept in being and active, even though they were to be crowned now by a new method.

> 'Social reform during the past eighty years,' he wrote in 1912, 'may be said to have proceeded in four successive stages, each of which has involved a nearer approach to the sources of life. The fourth stage, which in its beginnings dates only from the last years of the nineteenth century, takes us to the period before birth, and is concerned with the care of the child in the mother's womb. The next stage cannot fail to take us to the very source of life itself, lifting us beyond the task of purifying the conditions, and laying on us the further task of regulating the quantity and raising the quality of life at its very source. The duty of purifying, ordering, and consolidating the banks of the stream must still remain. None of the previous stages of social reform can be neglected. But when we are able to control the stream at its source we are able to some extent to prevent the contamination of that stream by filth, and ensure that its muddy floods shall not sweep away the results of our laborious work on the banks.'

We are now in a position to understand the motive of what was now to be Havelock Ellis's central preoccupation and life's work, the scientific study of sex phenomena in human society, resulting in the six monumental 'Studies in the Psychology of Sex.' These volumes, which were addressed to medical and psychological specialists rather than to the general public, appeared as follows: *The Evolution of Modesty* (1899); *Sexual Inversion* (1897); *Analysis of the Sexual Impulse* (1903); *Sexual Selection in Man* (1905); *Erotic Symbolism* (1906); and *Sex in Relation to Society* (1910). The second of these volumes, which appeared first, was the only one to be published in the first instance in England, for the appearance of *Sexual Inversion* involved a hapless bookseller in criminal proceedings for obscenity, and the other volumes had to be produced in the more enlightened atmosphere of America. The episode, if not edificatory, was enlightening. 'Ellis,' remarks the writer of the obituary notice in the *Manchester Guardian*, 'not having been prosecuted, had no standing in the court, and he had to listen to the Recorder's grossly offensive comments on his character and motives without any means of replying.' The proceedings shed a clear light upon the mentality of English society at the close of the last century, and form a singular contrast to the attitude of the general public towards 'problems of sex' at the present time. To Havelock Ellis, far more than to any other single individual, belongs the credit, if credit it be, for the occurrence of so notable a change, which indeed has amounted to a revolution. Nowadays one actually becomes, if anything, a little weary of 'sex' as a topic for discussion, and begins involuntarily to

yawn when the word is mentioned. But this is one of the penalties to be paid when a serious subject is canvassed on popular levels. Still, the penalty on the whole is well worth paying. Writing in 1933 in the Introduction to the abbreviated one-volume edition of his work on the Psychology of Sex (after the lapse, that is, of a generation), Ellis took note of the transformation of public opinion that had taken place :

> 'Sexual Psychology, normal and abnormal, as well as Sexual Hygiene, nowadays attracts a general interest and attention which before the present century was undreamed of. The young man of to-day is sometimes remarkably well informed in relation to the literature of sex, and the young woman of to-day often approaches these subjects in an inquiring spirit and with an absence of prudery which would have seemed to her grandmother absolutely impious. Until recent years any scientific preoccupation with sex was usually held to indicate, if not a vicious taste, at all events an unwholesome tendency. At the present time it is among the upholders of personal and public morality that the workers in sexual psychology and the advocates of sexual hygiene find the warmest support.'

It would be a mistake to imagine that the practical policies advocated by Ellis as a result of his exhaustive studies were unduly startling or in any way 'ultra-progressive.' He advocated no 'new ethic,' but only the introduction of some measure of common sense into the theory and practice of sexual conduct. He wrote, for example, of monogamy that,

> 'In one sense or another, it is to-day as firmly established as it has ever been, and even more so. By imparting to it a greater flexibility we to a considerable extent relieve it of the abuses to which in the former more rigid form it was subject.'

Of marriage (he was himself very happily married) he observed :

> 'Marriage in its main lines remains to-day, and is likely to remain, in the same form as we have always known it. To give it greater flexibility, to bring to it a finer intelligence, and to accord a greater sympathy to its varying needs, far from destroying it, is to impart to it a firmer stability.
>
> Marriage, we must never forget — as too often happens — is more than an erotic union. To the truly "ideal" marriage there go not only an erotic harmony, but a union of many-sided and ever-deepening non-erotic affection, a community of tastes and interests, a life in common, a probability of shared parenthood, and often an economic unity. The erotic element tends to become less prominent as the marriage in other respects becomes a closer bond. It may even disappear altogether and the marriage remain unshakeably firm in mutual devotion.'

Of course this says very little beyond what is said in the Marriage Service — that the institution of matrimony is 'for the

mutual society, help and comfort that the one ought to have for the other both in prosperity and in adversity'; but it is significant that this realistic, even if religious, view should have been endorsed by a scientific authority. Not but what in other respects the ecclesiastical view of marriage may not be unduly rigid. The truth is that the priests have always exploited the mystery of sex, just as they have exploited the mystery of death and even of human existence. When sex is no longer a mystery, it will no longer be exploitable—or not in quite the same way. Such is the social significance of pioneers like Havelock Ellis. In so far as their teachings are absorbed, they exert an anti-clerical influence. This may not on the whole be a bad thing.

But as has been indicated, Ellis was interested in sex because here lay the source of life, and he was anxious to improve the quality of human life. We must remember that he was not only a scientist, but a poet and idealist; thus his attitude was somewhat different from that of the normal student of genetics. Although he was not prepared to call Eugenics a religion,[1] any more than he was to do the like for Socialism, he regarded it in the light of an ideal, and termed it 'the science and art of Good Breeding in the human race.' For him Eugenics was neither 'a sort of higher cattle-breeding,' nor yet was it 'a cold-blooded selection of partners by some outside scientific authority.' Although he believed that the principles of satisfactory mating 'must be firmly grounded on a scientific basis of ascertained fact,' he was convinced that the natural, healthy instincts of mankind would always be found on the side of those principles. In an essay, 'Eugenics and Love,'[2] he wrote as follows:

> 'Those who advocate a higher and more scientific conscience in matters of mating are by no means plotting against love, which is for the most part on their side, but rather against the influences that do violence to love: on the one hand, the reckless and thoughtless yielding to mere momentary desire, and, on the other hand, the still more fatal influences of wealth and position and worldly convenience which give a factitious value to persons who would never appear attractive partners in life were love and eugenic ideals left to go hand in hand. . . . The eugenic ideal will have to struggle with the criminal, and still more resolutely with the rich; it will have few serious quarrels with normal and well-constituted lovers.'

[1] The pioneer Francis Galton looked upon eugenics as fitted to become a factor in religion.

[2] To be found in the volume *The Task of Social Hygiene.*

It will be seen from the last paragraph that Havelock Ellis had little in common with those eugenists who use their theories in support of a complacent wealth-loving snobbery, and whose concern is to prohibit the 'lower orders' from obeying the precept to 'increase and multiply.' It is after all not among the exhausted and inbred 'upper classes' that the best stocks are necessarily to be found.

As would necessarily follow from the foregoing, Havelock Ellis was not of the number of those who fall into a panic or a fury of moral indignation at the decline of the birth-rate, which he regarded as a more or less inevitable concomitant of an advancing civilization. It must be admitted that he wrote before the days when a prolific birth-rate was advocated by patriots as a means of securing adequate supplies of cannon-fodder. In his day European civilization seemed to be tending in a pacific direction. But still, however much in error he may have been, his remarks are worth quoting:

> 'This tendency of the birth-rate to fall with the growth of social stability is thus a tendency which is of the very essence of civilization. It represents an impulse which, however deliberate it may be in the individual, may, in the community, be looked upon as an instinctive effort to gain more complete control of the conditions of life, and to grapple more efficiently with the problems of misery and disease and death.'

Certainly in India, China and Japan most of their present evils arise from over-population, and it is arguable that if the population of certain European countries, our own included, were half what it now is, the need for recurrent wars would not exist. The Scandinavian countries, with a low birth-rate, are highly pacific; the Balkans, where men breed more indiscriminately, have proved a source of unrest. And it is noteworthy that in totalitarian States with ambitious programmes of conquest women are urged to bear a maximum number of offspring, whether within the bond of matrimony or outside it.

It is certainly the case that the writings of Havelock Ellis 'date.' There is a certain naïvity about them characteristic of those who reached maturity in the Victorian epoch. He thought that the simple life, combined with a certain measure of sexual hygiene, would work miracles. To some extent his precepts have been followed. The cheap motor car, the caravan, the holiday

camp, and so forth have converted large sections of the public into lovers of the open air. Many young people would be glad enough of the opportunity of escaping from the routine of business for a few months into the New South Wales bush, or to sail over those spaces of the Pacific where the Trade winds blow perpetually between a blue sea and a wide sky set with mountainous white clouds.

There must be few who do not at times wonder whether civilization has not been a mistake, and whether we ought not to seek, with Edward Carpenter, its 'cause and cure.' Certainly *our* civilization (*i.e.* the Western European brand) seems to have lost its way. Yet no Havelock Ellis can solve *our* problems for us, for each generation must solve its own problems. Yet Ellis was a sincere, honest and intelligent man, and it is that *kind* of man, all too rare, who alone can solve problems whenever and wherever they exist. What we need in these days is not rhetoric, moral exhortation, whether from platform or pulpit, but *scientific* idealism. We need the seer and we need the scientist; and all the more so when embodied in one man. At present science is being prostituted too often to destructive ends. Will the younger generation of scientific workers take a leaf out of Havelock Ellis's book and regard science as an instrument for human betterment? The scientists have a good chance, for they possess the ear of the public to a degree enjoyed by no other class of the community. Bishops, politicians, journalists, novelists, cinema stars, popular sportsmen, all have their say — often at great length. They speak eloquently, interestingly, and (the bishops at least) in an edificatory manner; but too often they lack the one thing needful — knowledge. The scientific expert, on the other hand, has the knowledge, but too often he is a narrow specialist, 'an intelligence within high walls,' to use T. E. Lawrence's phrase. If science and vision could only be combined, as Havelock Ellis in his day certainly combined them! The prospects of the future would then be a good deal brighter than they can be said to be at present.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NEED FOR A NEW ADVENTURE*

The book before us ardently desires the reunion of the Church, a desire undoubtedly according to the will of Christ. We are therefore bound to give a welcome to the purpose behind the book, even though it may appear to us that the statements in the book itself make reunion more difficult. The author's thesis in brief is that the one great obstacle to reunion is the failure of Christians generally to accept the theory which he holds of the Church and the Ministry. A large part of the book is devoted to an exposition of this theory, and an attempt to prove it from Holy Scripture. One is reluctant to try in a few words to criticize a theory developed at such length; but perhaps it will be sufficient to say that the exegesis of the Old Testament is not such as to commend itself to Old Testament scholars. What can one think of an author who uses the Book of Chronicles to find the reason why David did not build the temple, or who accepts the validity of the priesthood of Jerusalem and the invalidity of the priesthood of Bethel on the *ex parte* opinion of Judahite historians? Surely the inferiority of the priests of Bethel is proved by their failure to raise the religion of the Northern Kingdom to the level of the South, and is not to be established by the statement of *1 Kings* that the priests of Bethel were appointed by Jeroboam and not by God. This kind of treatment of Scripture evidence runs through the book, and what appears to the author as the only true and Scriptural doctrine of the Church and the Ministry appears to us as merely the opinion of the party to which the author belonged. The strength of the Church of England as it is at present, and its position as a bridge-Church to lead the way towards fuller reunion, is the co-operation in one body of people holding diverse opinions about the ministry which they have in common. No layman or priest of the Church of England is asked to define his theory of the Ministry. In the present state of our knowledge various theories held within the Church of England can equally claim Scriptural support, and no one with any acquaintance with Biblical scholarship would dare to say that the greatest scholars of the Old and New Testaments were confined to the ranks of Anglo-Catholics.

The references to the proposals for reunion in South India appear to the reviewer particularly unfortunate. The scheme is described as 'full steam ahead in a thick fog and over an uncharted sea.' The blame for its failure to materialize is attributed to the disagreements of the negotiators, and the opponents of the scheme are said to be as free from blame as its supporters. The truth, as known to those who have been in India, is that whenever opponents have come inside the council chamber they have been

* *The Church of England and Reunion.* By H. L. Goudge, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 1938. 8/6.)

carried along by the Spirit to become supporters of the scheme. The scheme has been held up so far by opponents, on both sides, who are outside the negotiations, mostly in England, and have not breathed the atmosphere in which the Spirit is drawing men along a new path of which they are dimly aware but which is as clear to Him as the path by which He led St. Paul past Bithynia and Mysia to Troas and Macedonia.

The author speaks much of priests and prophets, and would have us value the priests of the Old Testament the more highly of the two. In an amazing passage he puts the priests of the Exilic and Post-exilic periods above the prophets. Yet every Old Testament scholar knows that it was the rigidity of the Post-exilic priesthood which led to the refusal of Second Isaiah's call to the nation to be the evangelist of the world, and led eventually to the extinction of prophecy and the decline of Judaism. Our Lord at any rate rested more on Second Isaiah than on Ezra the priest and scribe; and the sign that He offered the people was the sign of Jonah—the book which bravely opposed the narrowness of Ezra.

The book is not unfair in its diagnosis of the faults on all sides which have led to disunion. It lacks the vision to see that the reunion of the future is to be a new thing, not resting on old theories which have failed to commend themselves to the whole Christian people. The reunited Church will be a greater thing than the Church before it was disunited—adumbrated doubtless in the Pauline Epistles, though scarcely at all in the Old Testament. For this greater reality of the future the Spirit calls our generation to new adventures of the mind and soul. There is need of profound critical scholarship of the Bible and a willingness to face afresh the problems of theology with the ever-increasing equipment of human knowledge and thought, wielded by men who consciously subject their intellectual powers to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and are not afraid of traversing paths hitherto untrodden by the foot of man. L. E. Browne.

EDUCATION FOR CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE*

Education for Christian Marriage is an ambitious volume, well worthy of careful study by thoughtful readers. Ambitious, because it seeks to provide not only a preparation for marriage, but also constructive help in the bringing up of a family. This is a Symposium, as such books are called (or miscalled), with its inevitable divergences of outlook. The Rev. A. S. Nash, the editor, in chapters i and xi, shows himself so well read in the literature of Marriage and of the Family that these two chapters alone supply a sound introduction to the general subject. He is critical of the traditional ecclesiastical attitude, agreeing with several modern religious writers that 'there is no rule of conduct which is independent of circumstances, binding upon all Christians.' In the later chapter he lays stress

* *Education for Christian Marriage.* Edited by A. S. Nash, M.A., M.Sc. With Foreword by the Archbishop of York. (Student Christian Movement Press. 7/6 net. 1939.)

on the primacy of the home in the religious education of children, especially of the pre-school age — the age when the 'style' of future life is formed. There alone, too, is possible the instruction of every child in the functions of the body before it becomes emotionally interested, and as soon as it begins to ask questions. Thus can be laid the foundation of a healthy attitude for the after life, specially on sex questions.

In chapter ii Prof. Piper regards sexuality as perfectly good and natural, and rightly protests against the impression of many Christians that the sexual breaks into their life as something foreign and hostile to their spiritual nature, instead of its main driving force. But he holds that its real purpose must be a strictly monogamous marriage for good and all. He thinks also that the sexual perception of any man is decisively determined by the circumstances of his first sexual experience. 'Whoever sins here even once, destroys for ever the meaning of his sexual life.' If such a statement were true (which it is not) it would condemn the sexual attitude of large numbers of men. Can such a view square with the facts of life, or with the attitude of Jesus?

Nor can we get much help from Prof. Dodd in chapter iii. He draws a distinction between the principles laid down by Christ in the Gospels and our knowledge of the 'mind of Christ' in particular cases. It is a hard distinction, which assumes a knowledge both of *ipsissima verba* and of their context. As to the actual sayings, he himself admits that even Mark *adds* another clause (forbidding the wife to put away her husband); and says that Matthew *makes* Jesus a supporter of Shammai, which he (Prof. Dodd) regards as untrue. How then can we be sure what was the mind of Christ? This writer (who is the Norris-Hulse Professor, with Alan Richardson as co-writer) then considers early Christian tradition, quoting St. Paul, whose authority he seems to consider final, though he admits the Pauline ideal to be based on the expectation of a speedy end to the world. We are left with the impression that he believes in a fixed rule of indissolubility of marriage for Christians. There is, however, in this book no set-piece discussion of divorce; but there is clearly a good deal of divergence of view implied between the writers.

Grace Calver discusses wisely the psychology of infancy and childhood. Healthy emotional development is the secret of useful life and happy marriage; the basic emotional attitudes are built up in childhood; the thwarting of their growth causes repression to the childish level. In the matter of religion, she says, 'our precepts may be ideal, but it is our behaviour which motivates the child.'

Philip Metman deals with adolescence and early adult life. This essay also is psychological, but is too difficult for the average reader; the present reviewer is interested in dreams, but is puzzled to interpret the unexplained dream at the end of the essay. In this there is no adequate reference to the homosexual tendencies of adolescence—a serious omission. This however

is partly atoned for in the next chapter by Graham Ikin, in a discussion of Moral Disease, Sin and Responsibility. This article is as good as it is short. He boldly compares the 'sin' of a backward unmarried girl who becomes pregnant with the 'sin' of an intelligent woman marrying a man for money without love. Which is worse?

Fritz Borinski tells us of the position of the family, especially of the wife, in Greece, Rome, Germany and modern European States. It seems a moot point whether the rise in the position of women is (historically) due to Christianity. Even Thomas Aquinas speaks of woman as mis-shapen man. But the cult of the Blessed Virgin did something to raise her status.

Mrs. Nash deals with the position of women in marriage at the present day, in Germany, Russia, and here. She attacks the present economic and social inequalities. The last sixty pages of the book deal with the methods of education for marriage, whether in lectures, classes or individually, whether by parson or doctor. Perhaps the best of these are those written by Canon Pym and Edward Griffith.

But there still remain two chapters which deserve wide publicity. The one (pp. 173-194) on the legal status of marriage and the family — a fine compendium of the development of marriage law in the West, especially in England, and well up to date. It is well worth careful study. Our marriage law to-day 'is still based on the Christian conception of Western Canon Law, taken over from the old Ecclesiastical Courts, and modified to an increasing extent by Act of Parliament.'

The other chapter to which special attention is called is that by the Rev. G. L. Russell, M.B., Ch.B. This essay of some 34 pages is a most able survey of some of the medical aspects of marriage. Both this chapter and its appendix (on contraception) ought to be read by all candidates for marriage, specially by men, though not unsuitable for women also. In Christian marriage, as in all marriage, the sexual factor is basic. If sex-intercourse is felt to be degrading, there is grave danger that the whole of the relationship will become starved or poisoned. This writer speaks of disease conditions which may preclude marriage; deals with the anatomy and psychology of the sex-organs, and quite frankly with their functions. This chapter has been condemned as indecent by some ecclesiastics; that would be incomprehensible if it were not for the ignorance, prejudice and obscurantism which, on this subject, are the chief qualifications of many elderly men—not clergy only—for judgment. As against such censure, we need only point to the approving foreword by the Archbishop of York. Mr. Russell only intended this chapter for teachers; but why not for all and sundry? Teachers have to learn, like the rest of us.

In conclusion, stress must be laid on two points. To the first of these Mr. Nash draws special attention (p. 225), namely, that the origin of marriage lies in the family, not the origin of the family in marriage. From the evolutionary standpoint, this is obvious enough; but it is apt to escape

notice, though it is fundamental to a right concept of marriage. The second point is not clearly stated, though perhaps implied; namely, that in the history of the race sex has been the foundation upon which the whole spiritual superstructure of mankind has been built. That is a thesis which deserves at least an essay to itself, if not a volume.

The editor of this book deserves congratulation on his comprehensive effort, for which he is admirably qualified.

DOUGLAS WHITE.

A DUTCH 'VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE'*

The translator of this comprehensive study of the manifestations of religion compares it to William James's highly original, historically important and readably attractive *Varieties of Religious Experience*. The comparison might be justified if only the 'bones' of the book were considered: it would, however, be misleading if regard is given to form, structure and literary grace.

Prof. van der Leeuw carries on at Gröningen the valuable work which has been done by his countrymen in Holland since what we call 'the Comparative Study of Religion,' or 'the History of Religion,' came to take its rightful place in nineteenth century religious thought. The present volume is in the succession of Chantepie de la Saussaye's famous *Manual of the Science of Religion*, to which our author frequently refers.

Its sub-title is 'A Study in Phenomenology.' At the end of the book—in the section devoted to 'Epilegomena'—the author discusses what he precisely means by 'the phenomenology of religion,' distinguishing it from 'the history of religion,' 'the psychology of religion,' 'the philosophy of religion,' and 'theology.' It is not altogether easy to perceive the necessity for yet another term. Any scientific study of 'religion' must be concerned with its 'phenomena,' that is, with its manifestations. For apart from its manifestations what is there for science to discuss? Such scientific study is necessarily 'systematic,' and, further, approaches its data without philosophical or theological prepossessions. To the present reviewer it does not seem likely that in England the phrase 'phenomenology of religion' will commend itself as necessary.

The book itself is so wide in its range that it is impossible in a brief review to do more than call attention to its essential character. It is divided into five main parts. The first deals with 'The Object of Religion,' that is, with the object to reflective thought of the manifestations of religion. The second part deals with 'The Subject of Religion' and is sub-divided into 'The Sacred Man,' 'The Sacred Community' and 'The Sacred within Man:

* *Religion in Essence and Manifestation: A Study in Phenomenology.* By G. van der Leeuw, Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Gröningen; translated by J. E. Turner, Reader in Philosophy in the University of Liverpool. (Allen and Unwin. 1938. 25/- net.)

the Soul.' The third part is devoted to 'Object and Subject in their Reciprocal Operation,' sub-divided into 'Outward Action' and 'Inward Action.' The fourth part is concerned with 'The World,' and the fifth part with 'Forms,' dealing, first, with the different types of 'religions,' and, second, with the different types of 'Founders.' These five parts are composed of one hundred and six chapters. The great number of chapters indicates both the extensive range of the subjects discussed and the necessarily restricted character of many of the discussions. Some of the chapters consist of but a few paragraphs, while some contain considerable discussions. It is interesting to note that the longest chapter in the book is on 'Mysticism,' while the shortest is on 'Adoration.' It should not be concluded that this disproportion indicates the fundamental theological loyalties of the author.

Prof. van der Leeuw writes, as befits his theme, in an objective manner. Necessarily, however, such 'objective' studies lead up to the final theological questions. Indeed, I have yet to read an 'objective' study which does not manifest, in greater or lesser degree, the theological conclusions of the author. Prof. van der Leeuw writes as one who is convinced that the story of 'religion' is not just a story of *man*: it is a story of the activity of God. This conviction is, of course, philosophical and theological: just as much so as, shall we say, the negative conclusion with which Reinach began his *Orpheus*. As far as the Christian theologian is concerned, the chief interest in Prof. van der Leeuw's book will probably be in the manifest influence upon it of tendencies and conclusions, characteristic of continental theology. This influence is seen in the multitudinous references to, and quotations from, continental religious thinkers. It is also manifest in the paradoxical nature of the thought and of the style. To give but one illustration:

> 'No religion—is the religion of atheism: nevertheless every religion without exception is atheism. For every religion recognizes the element of flight from God; and atheism, that is to say, the deepest doubt, induces in religion a radical tension and thus preserves it from stagnation. As long as a religion is living, therefore, it will include among its adherents fools who say in their hearts, "There is no God."'

The final question which emerges from the perusal of the book is: *What kind of God* does the author believe in? The combination, in one and the same book, of the view that the Divine activity is manifest throughout *the whole* of man's religious history, and of the language, style and thought of continental 'crisis' theology leaves the answer to this question obscure.

To the translator of this comprehensive and erudite study are due the warm thanks of the British reader. This sense of indebtedness would have been even less unhesitating had he given us an Index of Names. Such an Index should, surely accompany all books of this character.

C. J. Wright.

Didsbury College.

A LECTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN PROSE*

The sacred classic of the Christian Church in its triple form — Old Testament, Apocrypha, New Testament — can never be replaced by any other sacred Scriptures. Christian studies have, however, made increasingly clear to us what was only dimly discerned by the most intelligent of our Christian ancestors: that the moral and spiritual value of different portions of our classic vary greatly—so much, indeed, that some portions of the classic are to-day deemed hardly worthy of the attention of Christian people because they are so very much below the moral and spiritual level of the Christian religion. Moreover the belief in the plenary verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture which gave to the Bible an awful significance, not possessed by any other book in the world, has been surrendered to a truer view of the significance of the Bible which has brought it into much closer relations, not only with the classics of other religions, but also into a much closer relationship with later Christian writings. On the other hand, this abandonment of the belief in the plenary verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture has done nothing to destroy the unique quality of the Bible as a religious classic. It has, however, rendered increasingly valuable and precious the noblest examples of later Christian literature which owe their inspiration not only in many cases to Bible models, but also to the growing conviction that the Divine Spirit whose influence is witnessed to in the Bible record is ever operating in human life, especially in the successive ages of the Church's history. This record, as it appears in the lives of Christian leaders, the teaching of Christian scholars, the prayers and meditations of Christian saints, and the reflections of Christian philosophers is not only deserving of the attention of modern Christian men and women, but is a necessity for their right understanding of the development of the Christian religion and the many-sided application of Christian principles to the needs and problems of modern life. In the study of such literature we can observe in a most inspiring and educative manner both the continuity and the development of the Christian religion—the operation of the Divine Spirit, Whose activities did not cease with the close of the New Testament Canon but Who continues in many parts and divers manners to carry on the education of mankind.

We welcome therefore, as a real contribution to Christian education, Dr. Bouquet's excellent *Lectionary of Christian Prose*, intended, not primarily for private reading, but for use in public worship. It is for this reason that the lections have been arranged under the headings of the great festivals and Sundays of the Christian year. In making his collection Dr. Bouquet has been guided by seven principles:

1. The passages must be good English prose.

*A *Lectionary of Christian Prose*. By A. C. Bouquet, D.D. (Longmans. 10/6 net. 1939.)

2. They must lend themselves to reading aloud.
3. They must be capable of annual repetition without growing stale.
4. They must reflect a comprehensive and essential orthodoxy.
5. They must show genuine inspiration.
6. They must as far as possible be classics.
7. If biographies, they must recount lives and episodes typical of the main varieties of heroic Christian virtue.

Users of this volume will recognize that Dr. Bouquet has striven successfully to put these principles into practice. This will not mean that the reader may not feel on occasions that some lections might be omitted without loss and other lections more profitably substituted. In such a collection very sparing use ought to be made of Christian hagiology because, in so many cases, edification has appeared to its writers to be more important than historic truth, and as a consequence pious sentimentality has too often been used to embellish simple piety. For example, the extract from the Life of St. Rose of Lima seems to us to err in this direction.

Dr. Bouquet does not venture to suggest that any of his selections should be substituted for Holy Scripture in the regular services of the Church, but that his selections may be used for occasional services in church, chapel and school. They will certainly be found to be of great help to the preacher as suggesting both themes and illustrations for his discourses. It is gratifying that this undertaking, demanding so much erudition, patient labour and good taste, should first have been projected at an Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen and that it should have received encouragement and financial support from Dr. Bouquet's fellow-members of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

We observe that Dr. Bouquet has honoured the *Modern Churchman* by including in his selection a passage on 'Faith and Sincerity' contributed to its pages by the Rev. J. S. Boys-Smith (Vol. XXVIII, p. 395).

H.D.A.M.

THE SCOURGE OF THE JEWS*

The present misfortunes of the Jews have revived an interest in the former persecutions which they have suffered. Mr. Hope has produced a readable and accurate short life of one who has left a name as an embodiment of cruelty, and whom the Roman Catholic Church, in spite of his eminent services, has prudently left uncanonised. The book is well illustrated, mainly from paintings in the monastery at Avila which Torquemada built and where he spent his last years. Mr. Hope writes as a Spanish scholar rather than as an ecclesiastical historian, and explains carefully how the Spanish Inquisition differed from the Papal Inquistion and why it received the royal support without which it would have been ineffective. The two main achievements of Torquemada's life, his introduction of the Inquisition into Spain, from which it had been free in the Middle Ages,

* *Torquemada, Scourge of the Jews.* By Thomas Hope. (Allen and Unwin. 1939. 8/6.)

and the expulsion of the Jews, were closely linked. Spain since the time of Priscillian has scarcely produced a heretic of eminence, unless we include the Unitarian Servetus and the Quietist, Molinos, and the Reformation was not acceptable to the Spanish temperament. The work of the Inquisition in Spain was to stir up hatred against the Jews, and so to compel them either to conversion or emigration. The result of forced conversion was to create a large number of crypto-Jews, whose secret apostasy it was the business of the Inquisition to discover. Torquemada, himself partly of Jewish blood, threw himself into the work with the typical Spanish ferocity which largely explains the notoriety enjoyed by the Spanish branch of the Inquisition, whose management was carefully guarded from papal encroachment, for that tended to clemency in the interest of the Roman revenues. The marriage of Ferdinand of Aragon with Isabella of Castile, the conquest of Granada and the expulsion of the Jews changed Spain in one generation from a medieval to a modern country, with nationality under a religious guise as the basis of the state. Mr. Hope's treatment is for the most part brief, but he devotes special attention to the La Guardia trial, for the ritual murder of a boy, which facilitated the outbreak of popular fury leading to the expulsion of the Jews. The book is not for the squeamish, but others will read it with interest. The works of Professor Turberville and Dr. Cecil Roth on the Inquisition might have been added to the bibliography.

P. R. SMYTHE.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

CHRIST AND WAR.

SIR,

The editorials in the November issue of the *Modern Churchman* arouse many questions in the mind of a plain-thinking member of the Church. May I be allowed to mention a few of these? — for to me they are far from unpractical.

If war is 'the greatest of crimes,' as seems to be admitted, how then can it be the only way of preventing the world being 'handed over in its international relations to injustice, bad faith,' etc., etc.?

If war is 'of the devil,' as was said at Lambeth, how can it be at the same time the way of Christ?

If Christ required single-mindedness in His followers above all things, how can they admit that loyal citizenship involves and justifies the adoption of what is practically a double standard of living?

Among people generally one is thankful up till now to sense a certain difference of attitude towards war from that of 1914—something far more realistic and critical. It has been realized increasingly that war is essentially unjust, partly because it brings untold suffering on the innocent, but chiefly because it abrogates law and impartial judgment; and therefore, whether the cause be good or bad, essential injustice remains. Yet the Church of England apparently still clings actively to Article XXXVII, affirming that wars can be 'righteous.' How can righteousness and injustice walk together?

It is difficult to see in what one is able to comprehend of Christ as the Way, anything remotely corresponding to the righting of wrongs by methods of violence. One can see that He never compromised with evil by

a hair's breadth, that He never condoned it, that He never attributed sincerity where sincerity did not exist—'He knew what was in man.' Moreover His life, one can see, was victorious in the real sense from beginning to end. But surely His conquest of evil depended upon His refusal to touch any means incompatible with the purity of His purpose? Did He thus show the way for His Church to-day? Or did He not?

It seems to me that what is distinctive of Christianity is not the mere preference for peace which has been deeply rooted in civilization all through history, in spite of recurrent war making; rather it seems to me to be the way or path of peace inherent in the principles governing the action and teaching of our Lord.

Admittedly the path is hard to find, but is not the finding and following of that path to-day the crucial problem now before the Church as such? It is difficult to see any hope of its solution unless the Christian Church takes its *start* from the position, 'Whatever be the way of Christ to-day, it cannot be the way of violence,' and works by that light, however dim it may be, towards a way of life amongst all peoples of the world that shall provide for the righting of wrongs and the satisfying of reasonable ambitions without resort to violence.

GRACE OWEN.

The Firs, Appleton-le-Moors, York.

[We cannot admit that war is 'the greatest of crimes.' Some wars come in that class, *e.g.* wars of rapine and aggression, but wars fought in the last resort by a nation to protect its freedom and civilization against unrighteous aggression certainly come in the class of righteous wars. We are convinced that the Christian Church must carry out its work of promoting the Gospel among mankind without resort to violence, but—Are the methods of the Church to be also the methods of the Christian State? To this question the answer must be negative, until 'the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our God and His Christ.' Then the sword of civic justice can be sheathed and the sword of the Spirit be used alone.

Our article, 'The Prince of Peace,' published in this issue, deals with this difficult problem of Christ and War more fully.

ED., *M.C.*]

SIR,

With reference to the article on 'God's Responsibility for the War' in your November issue, I should be glad if you will give me some information on the following points.

1. Canon Peter Green says God allowed the war for some good purpose. If this is so, is it right to offer prayers for peace which, if answered, would frustrate the good purpose?

2. Does the wise and just schoolmaster punish his boys whether good or bad? Does a surgeon perform an operation on the healthy as well as on the diseased? Does a farmer burn off the wheat as well as the weeds if he has the power to prevent it?

3. Has the Almighty the power to prevent suffering to little children? Why should they suffer for the vices and folly of the community, which apparently God allows equally with war, 'or they could not have happened.'

F. C. D. SIDDALL.

Waltham Abbey, Essex.

SIR,

THE BANKRUPTCY OF PACIFISM.

As another member of the Union I am grateful to you for printing Mr. Mauleverer's letter in regard to the attitude of the *Modern Churchman* to this war. The issue is surely a vital one at the present time, and therefore I hope that you will spare space for me to deal with the points that you raise in your editorial reply.

1. On page 468 you quote with apparent approval Bishop Talbot's defence of compromise. On page 469 you quote (also with apparent agreement) Hitler's rejection of compromise with the implication that there can be no compromise with him. Are we to have compromise just when and where it suits our argument? For myself I do not see, if we are involved in a struggle between the Christian religion and anti-Christ, how there can be any compromise in the spiritual sphere.

2. I would ask you to accept the description 'ideology' in regard to the religious aspect of Hitlerism, as it seems to me to avoid the endless confusion into which we fall if we speak of Nazism as a religion. Pacifist philosophy (to which you, Sir, and others seem unwilling to give attention and understanding) is an interpretation of Christianity in the light of the dramatic act of the Crucifixion, and is therefore an 'ideology.' It is pacifism which is the antithesis of Hitlerism, not crusading, which is a material method of expressing an ideology which to us seems very similar to that of Hitler.

3. Your assumption that the fighter is willing to give his life for the right is one that does credit and justice to a certain number of fighting men, but it is clean contrary to the intention of those who sent them out to fight. I served for two years as an officer in the Labour Corps in the last war. If I remember rightly, we were more than once served with Army Orders, and even personal instructions, to the effect that it was the business of the fighting men to have done with soft sentiment about giving one's life; it was his business to kill as many of the enemy as possible. Efforts were continually made to educate the soldier in brutality, as contact with Germans showed him that they were men like himself and loathed the business as much as he. In some cases these lessons in brutality were only too well learned and brought back into civilian life.

4. Very few historians will endorse another implicit assumption of yours that all the responsibility for this war rests on one man or even on one side. The vindictiveness of the Treaty of Versailles rested on the assumption of the 'guilty nation,' which has been exploded *ad nauseam*. The question of responsibility for this war cannot be solved by the facile method of taking account of Hitler's actions during the last year; it must take account of the dealings of statesmen of various nations over the whole period from 1918 onwards.

5. If our statesmen had been as valiant crusaders for the right as your arguments would imply (or is it only the fighters who are imbued with this spirit?) one would have thought that they would have been more active in their resistance to aggression long before last September. Most of all one would have thought that they would have taken the risk (and it would have been a great risk) of trying to defend Czecho-Slovakia, or at least of encouraging these unfortunate people to defend themselves, instead of delivering them bound to their enemies. If 'betrayal' seems too strong a word for our attitude at Munich to the Czechs, I can only say that I believe its use has already been endorsed by the verdict of history.

6. Lastly, there is this repeated charge that the pacifist has no constructive proposals. It is as if a man should start a vast conflagration and,

when it was well blazing, call in the Fire Brigade and abuse them for lack of constructive proposals. But the firemen would at least use sand and water to put out the blaze, not pour on petrol. The spirit in which this nation has entered upon this war is markedly different from the spirit abroad in 1914. I have discovered very little enthusiasm for the war; it seems to be greatest among clergy and the editorial articles of Church papers, and, of course, there is the arm-chair stay-at-home who urged the useless slaughter of the last war which our leaders now have the sense to avoid. The laity do not take it amiss if prayers are said for the Germans—a thing for which clergy were hounded from their benefices in the last war. Surely one reason for this is the spread of the spirit of pacifism and the knowledge of its principles?

Only the preservation of a balanced judgment and the recognition of a common responsibility for the failure to preserve peace will preserve us from another Versailles and another war in twenty-five years' time. And in this one hopes for some measure of leadership from Churchmen, without which the Church itself as we know it is likely to perish.

Birchfield Vicarage, Birmingham, 20. F. E. A. SHEPHERD.

[Our correspondent's letter seems to us to be a *mélange* of statements: some true, *e.g.* that our leaders were not as wise as they might have been; some half true, *e.g.* that our combatants are educated 'in brutality'; some false, *e.g.* that the German war-guilt of 1914 'has been exploded *ad nauseam*': and of *non-sequiturs*, *e.g.* the betrayal of the Czechs. If we betrayed the Czechs a year ago by not declaring war then on Germany, that can be no argument in favour of betraying them now. That Great Britain refrained from war as long as she did is at least evidence of her ardent desire to maintain peace at almost any price. What seems to us to the point is that we can find in Mr. Shepherd's letter no practical remedy for our present ills. It is an example of the bankruptcy of pacifism.

We have never contended that the Nazis were wrong in everything. What concerns us is that they are wrong in their aggression against weaker states. Having failed by persuasion, by argument, by warning to check this aggression, we are now resolved to end it by force directed by wisdom, humanity and justice.

May we add that a Christian philosophy based only on the Crucifixion is constructed on too narrow a basis. Bishop Westcott's essay on 'The Gospel of Creation' suggests this. ED., *M.C.*]

SIR, WHY DID NOT GOD STOP THE WAR?

One of Canon Peter Green's answers to the question 'Why did not God stop the War?' which appeared in your last issue is 'because "we chose the way of punishment and revenge" rather than the way of love and justice'; rather, many would now aver, did we choose the way of reparation and repression — financial or material reparation of devastation and repression of armaments, which, however, we failed to enforce, hence the result to-day. In most cases 'love and justice' to the devastated involves punishment to the aggressors. Thrice in my lifetime has Germany, under three different régimes, invaded her neighbours—in 1870, in 1914 and in 1938-39; therefore it is hard to convince us elders that the German people themselves, who have thrice suffered such governments to rule over them, do not share their war-guilt.

MABEL BOWEN.

Titcombe Manor, Kintbury, Berks.

PSYCHICAL RESEARCH AND A FUTURE LIFE.

SIR,

In the letter which appears in your November issue, Mr. Grimes speaks of various persons holding important positions who have related to him first-hand experiences of what may be called spontaneous psychic phenomena. I have received similar confidences from many in another sphere of life — that of the middle- and labouring-classes. The cumulative effects of these narratives, related by normal, sensible people, is a feeling of the reality of another order of life than that commonly recognized. Such communications should be of special interest to the clergy, but they are reserved for the sympathetic and open-minded.

It was, of course, the volume of such testimony from reliable persons in every walk of life that, fifty-seven years ago, led a few men of outstanding intellectual gifts to found the Society of Psychical Research. The amount of rigorously-sifted evidence for the supernormal which it has since put on record is very great, but the Society does not regard it as its function to formulate official conclusions upon the wealth of material it has accumulated. Its view is comparable to that of a learned body still adding to its store of facts suggesting the probability that the earth revolves round the sun but hesitating to pronounce a final judgment on the matter.

Some of the clergy appear to suppose that this official attitude of the S.P.R. shows that the most competent students of the subject do not consider that the known facts establish man's survival of death on a scientific basis. This is to ignore the definite convictions reached, after many years of investigation, and often after overcoming a strong bias in the opposite direction, of some of the most acute experimenters of the last half-century, many of whom were members of the Society.

The facts, as I see them, are that the considerations upon which, in the past, survival was generally accepted no longer carry conviction to thoughtful minds. The teaching of the clergy on what happens at and after 'death' has been (and still, I fear, often is) so vague, or else so confused and contradictory that persons of even average common sense are repelled by it. For it is composed mainly of conjectures, and inferences from conjectures, which it is entirely impossible to substantiate. Meanwhile, men such as Sir Arthur Keith and Mr. H. G. Wells, who have the public ear, assure their listeners that with the death of his body man himself is blotted out.

In the circumstances, it is bewildering to find the clergy (generally speaking) concluding a Herod-cum-Pilate alliance with materialists in ignoring or reducing the results obtained from the study of the only evidence which puts this vital matter beyond question by an elucidation of the facts. I would venture to recommend to any sufficiently interested an open-minded study of such a book as 'Personality survives Death,' in which the distinguished surgeon, Lady Barrett, gives a quiet account of communications received through the psychic, Mrs. Osborne Leonard, from her 'late' husband, Sir William Barrett, himself one of the founders of the S.P.R. and a physicist of European reputation. Both for the cogency of the evidence for the survival of the complete personality and for the value of the information given of aspects of life on the Other Side, this book is an example of the best literature of the subject, which is far more extensive than is generally recognised.

If I may conclude with a personal testimony, I myself have been privileged to receive communications through the gifted psychic mentioned above, a lady whose spiritual and intellectual endowments and absolute integrity

make her as unlike the popular idea of a 'medium' as a qualified doctor is to a quack. Through her I have received such an abundance of incontrovertible evidence of the continued existence in the fullness of life of many of my friends, who in ordinary speech would be described as 'dead,' that even my ingrained scepticism has capitulated. I no longer 'believe': I feel I can say 'I know.'

I recognise that the publication in the *Modern Churchman* of Mr. Grimes' admirable plea for unprejudiced enquiry affords the hope that Modernists, in so many other respects pioneers, will again lead the way in welcoming and using the evidence which alone can establish as demonstrated fact one of the foundations upon which the Christian Religion is based, the reality of a life beyond the grave.

ARCHIE F. WEBLING.

Risby Rectory, Bury St. Edmunds.

THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION COUNCIL ELECTION, 1940.

SIR,

I shall be glad if you will kindly give publicity to the following official notice to members of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

By the Constitution the following elected members of the Council retire on the day of the Annual General Meeting in May, 1940, and are not eligible for re-election, *viz.*: Rev. K. G. Budd, Mr. E. T. England, Miss W. M. Fayerman, Rev. G. L. H. Harvey, Miss Hilda Hubbard, Mr. S. K. Jones, Rev. T. H. Kilborn, Mr. H. F. Walker.

The following co-opted members of the Council retire at the same time, but are eligible for election, *viz.*: Miss E. M. Beaumont, Rev. J. S. Boys-Smith, Rev. L. B. Cross, Mr. W. P. Fuller, Rev. R. G. Griffith, Mr. R. B. Henderson, Rev. H. P. Kingdon, Rev. Canon W. H. Mackean, Rev. Canon R. D. Richardson and Rev. A. H. Streeten.

All other members of the Council whose names are in the list published in this magazine continue to serve.

Ten members are to be elected to the Council this year, and the nominations of candidates must reach the Secretary not later than March 1st. The names must be proposed and seconded by members of the Union, and the consent of the nominees should first be obtained. By the revised Constitution 'any member may nominate one or more (up to four) candidates for election to the Council.'

If more than ten nominations are received, voting papers will be sent to all members of the Union.

T. J. WOOD,
Organizing Secretary.

520 Grand Buildings,
Trafalgar Square, London, W.C.2.
1st January, 1940.

P.S.—The above notice is *cancelled* as the Standing Committee has decided not to hold the election this year.—T.J.W.

CORRECTION.

In November *Modern Churchman*, p. 419, line 9, read Dean for Chaplain.

[ED. *M.C.*]